

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have responded by amending claims 1 and 13.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-7 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U. S. Patent Application Number 2002/0098831 A1 issued to Castell et al. on July 25, 2002.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants' claim 1 recites,

"An apparatus, comprising:

one or more node components that, upon registration of one or more users in a second network subsequent to registration of one or more of the one or more users in a first network, serve to cause one or more mailbox profile portions, for one or more voice mailboxes that are associated with the one or more of the one or more users, to be copied from one or more first voicemail system components that are associated with the first network to one or more second voicemail system components that are associated with the second network, ...".

Castell does not teach this limitation. Instead, Castell discloses a unified messaging system for a mobile device. In the Office Action, the Examiner equates Castell's "configuration information" to applicants' "one or more mailbox

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

profile portions". Also, the Examiner equates Castell's "the voice mail mailboxes of PBX system 120" to applicants' "one or more first voicemail system components that are associated with the first network". Furthermore, the Examiner equates Castell's "corporate phone services 120" to applicants' "first network" and Castell's "unified messaging system" to applicants' "second network".

However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Castell does not teach "serve to cause one or more mailbox profile portions, for one or more voice mailboxes that are associated with the one or more of the one or more users, to be copied from one or more first voicemail system components that are associated with the first network to one or more second voicemail system components that are associated with the second network". This is because configuration information for the unified messaging system is kept in a data base for all mobile device users, as stated in paragraph 0028. Thus, Castell does not copy the configuration information, i.e., "one or more mailbox profile portions", of the voice mail mailboxes of PBX system 120, i.e., "one or more first voicemail system components that are associated with the first network" associated with corporate phone services 120, i.e., "the first network", to second voicemail system components associated with the unified messaging system, i.e., "the second network".

Thus, the clear teaching of Castell is that one or more node components that, upon registration of one or more users in a second network subsequent to registration of one or more of the one or more users in a first network, do not serve to cause one or more mailbox profile portions, for one or more voice mailboxes that are associated with the one or more of the one or more users, to be copied from one or more first voicemail system components that are associated with the first network to one or more second voicemail system components that are associated with the second network.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that Castell does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

Castell. Since claims 2-13 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Castell.

Independent claims 14 and 16 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Castell. For example, claim 14 recites, "copying, upon registration of a user in a second network subsequent to registration of the user in a first network, an address of a voicemail message on a second voice mailbox, on a second voicemail system component that is associated with the second network, from a first voice mailbox, on a first voicemail system component that is associated with the first network, to move an association with the user from the first voice mailbox to the second voice mailbox", and claim 16 recites "means in the medium for copying, upon registration of a user in a second network subsequent to registration of the user in a first network, an address of a voicemail message on a second voice mailbox, on a second voicemail system component that is associated with the second network, from a first voice mailbox, on a first voicemail system component that is associated with the first network, to move an association with the user from the first voice mailbox to the second voice mailbox". Castell does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, independent claims 14 and 16 are likewise allowable over Castell. Since claim 15 depends from claim 14 and claim 17 depends from claim 16, these dependent claims are also allowable over Castell.

LUC-321/Green 2-2-2-3-33

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: September 11, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
Customer Number 47382